DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 349 UD 031 272

AUTHOR Crowson, R. L.; Boyd, W. L.
TITLE Structures and Strategies: Toward an Understanding of Alternative Models for Coordinated Children's Services. Number 93-5b.
INSTITUTION National Research Center on Education in the Inner Cities, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 43p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; Ancillary School Services; Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Incentives; *Institutional Characteristics; *Integrated Services; Models; Partnerships in Education; Program Evaluation; Research Needs; School Community Programs; *Social Services; *Urban Areas; Urban Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Goal Setting; School Based Services

ABSTRACT

This paper compares and analyzes features of the models represented in five efforts to provide coordinated services for children and families located in five cities in an effort to determine how best to study these programs in the future. The programs are: (1) the Minneapolis Youth Trust (Minnesota), a city-wide partnership of member organizations; (2) the Nation of Tomorrow, Chicago (Illinois), a college, community, and school partnership; (3) the School of the Future initiative, Houston (Texas), a project for school-based services; (4) the Family Service Center, Los Angeles (California), a center for school-based services; and (5) A Child's Place, Charlotte (North Carolina), which provides services for homeless children and families. The review of the different program models indicates that, regardless of program specifics, certain areas are essential to a structural analysis. The first is the goal structuring process, and the second is the area of institutional interests and reward systems. The third focus should be on institutional environmental control, and the fourth should be the examination of institutional conventions. Every experiment in children's services coordination should be examined as a point along a process continuum from little or no integration of services to a collaborative ideal by exploring these four institutional characteristics. (Contains 4 tables and 48 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Publication Series

ED 400 349

Structures and Strategies: Toward an Understanding of Alternative Models for Coordinated Children's Services

by R. L. Crowson & W. L. Boyd

The National Center on Education in the Inner Cities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Shatfer
CRHDE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

UD 031 272

Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Structures and Strategies: Toward an Understanding of Alternative Models for Coordinated Children's Services

by R. L. Crowson & W. L. Boyd

The National Center on
Education in the Inner Cities

The research reported herein was supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education through a grant to the National Center on Education in the Inner Cities (CEIC) at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE). The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of the supporting agencies, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

UD031272

 # 93-5b

INTRODUCTION

The soaring number of American children living in poverty has triggered a surge of efforts to improve the coordination of services for children. With the breakdown of traditional family structures, the multiple needs of children and families, particularly in impoverished areas, are of unprecedented proportion. Sadly, our fragmented service-delivery system in urban America is far from adequate in meeting these needs. Many believe that human services institutions in urban environments (e.g., health, education, family social services) can be much more effective if restructured toward a complementary and coordinated system of assistance for children and families.

This problem is much easier to frame than are the structures of and strategies for its solution. There is no one "best way" to restructure human services institutions toward coordination. Although practical savvy about "what works" and "what doesn't" is growing, a great deal remains to be learned about the design and implementation of successful collaborative ventures (Behrman, 1992; Crowson & Boyd, 1993). Toward that end, and building upon our earlier review of the literature on coordination of children's services (Crowson & Boyd, 1993), this paper compares and analyzes features of the models represented in five coordinated services efforts located, respectively, in Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and Charlotte.

The variety of contemporary coordinated ventures is impressive. Efforts to date have ranged from state-level social services coordination, to state encouragement of local coordination; and from city- and county-wide initiatives, to neighborhood and school-site experimentation. Although schools have been involved in most of these projects, relatively little agreement exists concerning the best models for services coordination. For example, disagreement persists as to whether it is more effective for services coordination to be school-based, or based outside the school but closely linked to schooling; or community-based and not directly linked to schooling (Behrman, 1992). Furthermore, approaches to services coordination so far have ranged widely in the scope of services provided, the client populations targeted, the sources of funding, and the very nature of the collaborative relationship (e.g., informal and voluntary, formal and contracted, etc.).

Despite the diversity of approaches to services coordination thus far, many common administrative problems and issues have been faced in much of the current experimentation. Typically, these have included implementation difficulties in such matters as: blending professionals across agencies who have distinct and separate training; loosening up "turf" boundaries between service providers; developing meaningful communication between the collaborating partners; removing "red-tape" and rules/regulations constraining cooperation; and providing leadership in cross-agency situations in which there is little recourse to authority (Crowson & Boyd, 1993).

The commonalities in administrative issues are such that a number of very useful handbooks and guidelines for services integration have been developed. While respecting the diversity of approaches, these handbooks offer valuable suggestions to nearly all projects in such problem areas as the sharing of confidential information, locating funding sources, developing trust between agencies, designing an evaluation system, and involving the community (see, e.g., Bruner, 1991; Melaville & Blank, 1991; Blank, Melaville, & Asayesh, 1993).

These handbooks reflect an accumulation of knowledge on effective implementation of services coordination. They build on a solid growth in the understanding drawn from parallel experiences across diverse efforts, including such lighthouse experiments as "New Beginnings" in San Diego; the "Cities in Schools" projects in more than a dozen states; the "Walbridge Caring Communities" effort in St. Louis; and the "New Futures" interventions in four cities.

What the handbooks and guidelines and experiential evidence to date do not adequately provide, however, are insights into "deep structure" issues in cooperating institutions that may need to be addressed in successful services integration. Though unexamined, such issues are often recognized. It is not uncommon to find in the available handbooks such observations as: (a) "child- and family-serving institutions [must] fundamentally change the way they think, behave, and use their resources"; (b) training should help participants to "unlearn the attitudes and behaviors common in highly bureaucratic, agency-centered, and problem-oriented institutions"; and (c) "the culture inside all institutions and agencies represented on the collaborative must change" (Blank, Melaville, & Asayesh, 1993).

Despite the knowledge gained from experience, we still need to know more about the complex and difficult matter of bringing separate public-sector institutions toward successful collaboration. Talk of "fundamentally changing" the ways in which institutions behave and changing institutional "cultures" recognizes that deeply imbedded qualities of organizations tend to come into play in services-coordination experimentation. Among these deep structures are the separate reward and personnel systems; environmental relationships; operating procedures and conventions; and resource-management systems that uniquely characterize each institution's "lifespace." Difficult enough to fathom as separate institutions, the structures of institutions in processes of coordination can become exceedingly abstruse.

This analysis is enlivened by recent theorizing on the topic of institutional collaboration (see particularly, Gray, 1991; Gray & Wood, 1991; Wood & Gray, 1991). Our major goal is to identify and highlight some central questions to be asked, and some alternative administrative models to be explained within institutional collaboration. It is hoped that our analysis will help frame some of the key questions to be pursued in the next stage of our research--the development of a survey instrument from which to

learn more about the effective design and administration of alternative models for coordinated children's services.

BACKGROUND

There is wide variety and creativity in children's services coordination to date, and, as mentioned, no single best way to proceed. Nevertheless, as experimentation progresses, and indeed as the pace of program development increases, the pros and cons of comparative approaches to services coordination are beginning to emerge. Differences in impact may be associated with variation in the locus of service-provision. A school-based approach benefits from the school's position as a dominant neighborhood institution but can suffer from excessive control by schools. A school-linked approach can more effectively balance school and nonschool contributions but may still be too heavily "institutions-oriented." A community-based model can incorporate a wider diversity of resources and facilities (e.g., churches, community organizations, clubs) but may lose some focus in its dispersion of stakeholders (see Chaskin & Richman, 1992).

A sense of comparative models also can be gleaned from analyses of differing programmatic goals and program outcomes in services coordination (see Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1992). Some common programmatic foci to date have been parent education/participation and school-readiness intervention; teen pregnancy and teen parenting collaboration; dropout prevention; substance abuse prevention; and the more generic linkage of an array of services to children and families (e.g., educational, medical, mental health, welfare, employment, legal). In an examination of outcomes among a sample of 55 initiatives arranged by program type, Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1992) report some early (although varied) evidence of success. They also report, however, that the evidence is insufficient to gauge the extent to which collaboration is a contributing factor in these outcomes.

One important issue raised in our discussion and analysis is the *extent to which coordination among services is necessary and desirable*. The literature on coordinated services tends to be ambivalent. For example, while distinguishing between cooperation and collaboration, Hord (1986) says that both are "valued models, but each serves a unique purpose and yields a different return" (p. 22). She then, however, mars the distinctions by stating that "collaboration is highly recommended as the most appropriate mode for interorganizational relationships" (p. 26).

The five projects included in this examination vary in the degrees to which they approach the rational ideal of full coordination and collaboration, but each nevertheless has achieved some impressive results. The fact remains that any kind of cooperation is probably an improvement over a total (or almost

complete) lack of coordination. Each of the five projects examined, has moved well beyond the stage of simple cooperation and deserves accolades for its accomplishments.

The idea of alternative models for coordinated ventures has been advanced not only by Hord (1986), but also by Intriligator (1992), who suggests that interagency interactions can be usefully examined along a continuum of cooperation to coordination to collaboration. In cooperation, the independence of individual agencies may be affected only marginally, changes in institutional policy and structure are minimal, and "turf" is not a serious issue. Under collaboration (at the opposite end of the continuum), there will be a loss of institutional autonomy; *interagency* policymaking in place of agency independence; and a need to go beyond "turf" toward consensus and well-established trust. Experience in the United States thus far suggests that, rather than either cooperative, coordinative, or collaborative, some efforts have tended simply to be "co-located." Even in co-location, difficult issues can arise over shared facilities usage, managerial control, resource allocation, professions' protection, and information flow.

We have suggested (Boyd & Crowson, 1992) another way of comparing coordinated services, that is, according to their differing styles of administrative implementation. Projects are frequently initiated as *strategic* interventions, pragmatically and iteratively moving toward a goal of coordination and problem-solving as the project unfolds. An alternative model is a strategy of *systemic* reform, where key institutional constraints (e.g., conflicting reward systems, differing norms and conventions, professional training differences) are identified early and incorporated into strategically pre-planned reform implementation.

A more comprehensive comparison of theoretical models for organizational collaboration has been developed by Gray and Wood (1991). They warn that relatively little theory yet exists that adequately addresses interorganizational behavior and relationships. Nevertheless, Gray and Wood do find some worthwhile comparative explanations embedded in a range of six theoretical perspectives: (1) resource dependence theory; (2) social performance theory; (3) strategic management theory; (4) microeconomic theory; (5) social ecology theory; and (6) negotiated order theory.

In a companion piece, Wood and Gray (1991) suggest a means whereby the array of theoretical perspectives can provide at least the beginnings of a "general theory of collaboration." Key variables identified are: (a) the role of the convener in collaboration; (b) the impact of environmental complexity and control upon collaboration; and (c) the impact of both individual and collective self-interests upon collaboration.

In the pages that follow, we draw on much of this early work as a rough conceptual guide for an examination of a few selected efforts in children's services coordination. Brief profiles of children's services projects ("cases") in five cities are presented below, followed by an in-depth, comparative discussion of the projects from the perspective of institutional analyses.

THE CASES

The profiles presented below are based on information collected through site visits, interviews with project participants, descriptive and evaluative project reports, and presentations and discussions concerning the five projects presented at the National Center on Education in the Inner Cities' (CEIC) invitational conference on "School/Community Connections" held in October, 1992. The five projects are: "The Minneapolis Youth Trust"; the "Nation of Tomorrow" partnership in Chicago; Houston's "School of the Future" initiative; the "Family Service Center" project in East Los Angeles; and "A Child's Place" in Charlotte. Although not a part of CEIC's ongoing study, A Child's Place was represented at the October conference and is thus, included here for comparative purposes.

While these five projects cannot fully represent the current diversity and creativity in coordinated services experimentation, they do provide an instructive range of initiatives. Because they remain in various stages of development, the projects do not necessarily represent unequivocal models of success in services coordination. Still, each represents a significant advance over fragmented, traditional approaches to children's services. We begin our profiles with the Minneapolis Youth Trust, a city-wide, macro-level model. We then turn to profiles of four programs that focus on specific schools.

The Minneapolis Youth Trust

The Youth Trust is a city-wide collaborative organization involving Minneapolis employers, schools, and a number of youth-serving agencies. Formed in 1989, with leadership from the mayor's office, the Trust is focused heavily on strengthening the work readiness and employability of young people in Minneapolis. Self-described, its major goal is helping to prepare "youth growing up in Minneapolis with the skills and experiences needed to become productive workers and successful adults" (Scannapieco, 1992).

The Youth Trust is a partnership of "member" organizations (primarily Minneapolis-area businesses and nonprofit employers) who are asked to support the Trust by contributing annually, developing jobs for youths, and contributing volunteers (primarily mentors) from the ranks of their employees. In 1990-91, some 189 employers were contributing members of the Trust. Additional resources are provided by the McKnight Foundation.

The Trust is an umbrella organization, with three divisions of activity. The first division, the *Buddy System*, recruits adult volunteers from the member organizations to work with children and youth as friends, mentors, or tutors. The Buddy System matches adult volunteers in one-on-one or group relationships through such Minneapolis youth-serving agencies as Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Hennepin County Community Services, the Hmong American Partnership, the American Refugee Committee, and the University YMCA. The second division of the Trust is the *Job Connection*, an effort by members to help youths develop work values, career options, and successful work experiences. Employers provide internships and summer jobs, and work generally to develop the employability of Minneapolis' young people.

The third division of the Trust is *School Partners*, a set of school partnerships between businesses or nonprofit members of the Trust and Minneapolis Public Schools in relationships individually designed to match Trust-member resources to school needs. Some examples are: (a) a partnership between AT&T and Northeast Middle School to improve the development of academic, social, and emotional skills; (b) a relationship between General Mills and Bethune Academy to increase parental involvement; (c) a partnership between Honeywell and North High School to help keep students and teachers abreast of developments in technology; and (d) a relationship between Northeast State Bank and Holland Elementary School to provide employee volunteers and tutors.

As indicators of success, the Youth Trust points to its sizeable list of member organizations and individual volunteers; its great variety of active partnerships, programs, and activities; its success in providing summer jobs and community-service employment; its activities that teach employable skills; and its success in publicizing the work of the Trust. Feedback and evaluation also indicate some areas of concern, especially in clarifying the mission and role of the Youth Trust; in facilitating the collaboration behind the Trust; in establishing clearer and quicker lines of communication; in balancing growth in membership against improving services to members; in evaluating the overall impact of the Trust; and in nurturing good relations among collaborators in the Trust (e.g., among schools and their partners) (Johnson, 1992).

The Nation of Tomorrow, Chicago, Illinois

The Nation of Tomorrow project is a 5-year (1989-1994) partnership between the University of Illinois, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, four African-American and Hispanic communities in Chicago, and a target public elementary school in each community. The name is derived from a statement made 80 years ago by President Theodore Roosevelt: "When you take care of children, you are taking care of the nation of tomorrow."

With the University of Illinois as initiator and convener, the project attempts to link academia, public schools, parents, and various community agencies in a set of collaborative working relationships. School-based, in a group of Chicago elementary schools characterized by concentrations of poverty and racial isolation, the project seeks to improve children's learning and development as well as to change relationships and connections among key urban institutions.

The Nation of Tomorrow targets four primary elements in children's lives: (1) the family; (2) the school; (3) community child care and youth opportunities; and (4) community health care agencies. The project contains three major program components. The first of these, *Family Ties*, focuses on parent education and involvement in the education of their children at school. Its activities are intended to involve parents, social service providers, clergy, teachers, and other community leaders in developing parent education programs that will be taught by parents in each community. Parent involvement and institutional linkages are facilitated by teams of family advocates who are persons hired from each community.

A second component of the project is *Partners in Health*. This component seeks to promote the health of children and youth using a grassroots community-based approach to assist parents in understanding and taking greater responsibility for the primary health care of their children. It seeks to help parents learn more about the health care services available in their communities, how to gain access to them, and how to make them work in the best interests of their children. The work of this component is conducted primarily through the project's elementary schools by full-time school nurses whose responsibilities are to coordinate and work with teams of family and child advocates hired from within the community.

The third project component, *School Enhancement Activities*, is designed to assist teachers and administrators in each school with their own professional learning and development. The component is based on collaborative models of staff development. It proceeds from the premise that organizational problems in the school must be addressed before significant improvements can be made at the classroom level.

The project is administered by a University of Illinois-based director and staff, and is overseen by an operations board that consists of University, community, and school representatives. Each of the four sites is served by a full-time site director who works out of a project school and serves as a liaison between the University and the community and among community institutions (including the school) involved in the project.

By its second and third years of implementation (1991 and 1992), the Nation of Tomorrow reported some initial accomplishments in the professional development of school staff, particularly teachers, and in the growth of community/parental responsiveness to (and involvement in) services outreach (Dunbar, 1991). Inquiries into administrative issues during this period revealed difficulties common to services-coordination efforts elsewhere, particularly in: effectively moving partners toward collaboration; adapting the separate institutional procedures of partners to collaboration; resolving control and resource issues; and changing actor "mentalities" toward the services-coordination role (Crowson, Smylie, & Hare, 1992; Smylie, Crowson, & Hare, 1992).

Houston's School of the Future

With support from the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, three of Houston's public schools inaugurated the School of the Future project in the spring of 1990. The schools are a middle school serving grades 6-8, and two K-6 elementary schools. Similar projects were inaugurated simultaneously in Austin, Dallas, and San Antonio. The Houston schools serve concentrations of minority students (largely Hispanic) and communities experiencing critical inner-city problems, such as school dropout, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, inadequate health care, family poverty, and various unmet family needs.

The overall objective of this project is to enrich and enhance the lives of children in each of the school's communities through integration of health and human services; involvement of parents and teachers in the work of the school; involvement of both public and private organizations in the project as partners; and development of a strong commitment to the project among school staff members.

By 1992-93, the School of the Future project was in its third year--with a long list of activities underway to increase parents' involvement in the schools; provide family counseling; enrich the academic and extracurricular offerings of the schools; affect family functioning and student health-related problems; address alcohol and drug abuse issues; and coalesce neighborhood organizations around children/families and their needs.

A central focus of the School of the Future effort from its inception has been careful attention by the Hogg Foundation to research and process/product evaluation. Teams of evaluators, plus one social worker who plays a vital role as site-coordinator at each school, monitor program development and implementation. From this careful evaluation, a useful documentation of some key implementation issues in coordinated services experimentation has emerged. These analyses include some seemingly mundane but nevertheless important problems of finding space in overcrowded schools for added services, finding qualified applicants for newly designed roles as "parent volunteer coordinators," and getting satisfactory Spanish-language translations in the right dialects and vocabularies for each neighborhood.

The implementation problems to date have also included some difficult issues in blending the service additions into the instructional mission of the school, generating teacher commitment to the services-coordination perspective of the project, and overcoming a reluctance among parents to see the school as "a place to go" and indeed as a place where they can actively participate and even exercise leadership (Arvey & Tijerina, 1992).

The Family Service Center, East Los Angeles

The Murchison Street School, an elementary school in East Los Angeles, is the site of a newly developing Family Service Center. The K-6 school is among the

lowest-achieving schools in Los Angeles. It serves a deep-poverty neighborhood of the city; its student enrollment is more than 95% Hispanic.

The project has been initiated by school staff in partnership with the California State University at Los Angeles. The goal of the project is to improve student achievement through efforts to coordinate school and community resources in such a way as to achieve programmatic coherence and improved services for inner-city students and families.

Still in the early stages of implementation in late 1992, the Family Service Center started by opening a parent center within the Murchison Street School. The intent of this effort was to welcome parents, provide parenting workshops, channel parents into school involvement, and offer a resources/referral facility to families vis-a-vis services information.

A second element of the project, still in the initial stages of development in late 1992, is the implementation of a multiservice center at the school site to bring an array of city, county, and community agencies into cooperative alignment with the project. Agencies working closely with the Center early on have included a local community service center, a Latino Family Preservation Project, the University of Southern California Dental School, the California State University at Los Angeles, and two private nonprofit agencies involved in education and treatment for substance and alcohol abusers.

Staff members in the Center are assigned by their home agencies and work with clients on a referral basis. Case managers are employed by the Center to assess family-assistance needs, provide direct services when appropriate, refer families for assistance to appropriate agencies, follow up on referrals, monitor outcomes, and assist with transportation needs (Bilovsky & Zetlin, 1992; Zetlin & Bilovsky, 1992).

A Child's Place, Charlotte

Located in downtown Charlotte, A Child's Place provides education and a range of social services for homeless children and their families. The facility opened in the fall of 1989 in a downtown church, moving in 1992 to space in a nearby public elementary school. The client families and children tend to live in shelters or motels for the homeless in the downtown area.

The plight of the homeless in Charlotte sparked an initiative developed by the executive director of the nearby Travelers Aid Society, who was joined by several social workers at other community agencies. These individuals approached the administration of the Charlotte Public Schools. Additional pressure to "do something" came from influential members of the business community who were serving as board members at some of the community's social service agencies.

The highly transient students at A Child's Place remain an average of just 18 days. While enrolled, the students are provided with medical, dental, and eye exams, and other necessary health services. Clothing is provided as are school and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

personal-hygiene supplies. The center also assists in family resettlement and provides parent and child support and counseling.

The staff includes a coordinator, teacher, aide, and social worker (with the designation "family advocate"). The center is supported by the Charlotte Public Schools, corporate donors, and the contributions of private social service agencies. Public social service agencies are not involved.

An enlightening element in the service collaboration aspect of A Child's Place is an ongoing tension regarding its central role. As discussed by Mickelson, Yon, and Carlton-LaNey (1992), the center has been caught in an unresolved balancing of educational and welfare initiatives, which has resulted in difficulties in establishing its identity: Is A Child's Place fundamentally a school for homeless children with some added social-service elements? Or, is the center really a social agency with an added educational component?

The tension's origin might be traced to the fact that the initial staff and governing board emphasized education over social services and was replaced by a staff and board whose emphases are just the reverse. The conflict and tensions are evident regarding time usage; service priorities; planning; day-to-day operations; and the consistency of service "messages"-provided client families (Mickelson, Yon, & Carlton-LaNey, 1992).

The cases briefly profiled above represent two projects in which a local university is a key partner, one citywide project initiated with leadership from the mayor's office, one project with very little outside funding, and one project with much direct, initiatory involvement from a private foundation. Each of the projects involves the public school system, but with varying degrees of scope and intensity. The citywide Minneapolis effort employs a number of member-organization partnerships distributed among an array of city schools. The Chicago, Houston, and Los Angeles efforts, conversely, are focused on just one or at most four school sites. The Charlotte program began in a church and is now only incidentally lodged in a school.

The projects also differ somewhat in the degree to which the traditional educational roles and activities of schools are affected by collaboration. The Minneapolis partnerships tend to be "add-ons" with few demands upon educators to change roles or perspectives. The Chicago and Houston projects appear to seek a somewhat more extensive blending of the children's service missions into the instructional behavior of the schools. The Los Angeles effort likewise seeks a change in school missions but through the less intensive procedure of offering educators increased referral options for selectively identified children and families in need. The Charlotte program is as yet unclear as to whether it is primarily a social-service or education provider.

These comparative elements in the profiled cases are summarized in Table 1. It should be noted that all five projects utilize the services of at least one outside organization (often in the role of convener

as well as project participant) causing some expected impact upon the institutional behavior of a school or schools. In its simplest form, this expected impact may be an expansion of the noninstructional array of services to children and families; in a more complex form, the expected impact may be a change in the school's sense of mission and in the school's linkage between classroom instruction and this changed mission. In any inquiry into services coordination, it is important to determine the nature of the coordination's impact upon the school as an institution, and, alternatively, its expected impact upon any other cooperating institution(s).

Again, by no means should it be assumed that the cases profiled here encompass the full range of possible approaches or models for services coordination. Nor should it be assumed that these are all necessarily exemplary projects, deserving detailed replication. Furthermore, a number of other projects elsewhere have received more publicity. Among these are: "New Beginnings" in San Diego; the "Walbridge Caring Communities" in St. Louis; various schools across the nation involved in the Comer School Development Program; the "Success for All" experiments in Baltimore and elsewhere; and projects in four cities identified as the "New Futures" effort under the support of the Annie E. Casey Foundation (see Payzant, 1992; Blank, Melaville, & Asayesh, 1993; Dolan, 1992; Melaville & Blank, 1991; Wehlage, Smith, & Lipman, 1992).

FROM CASE-COMPARISON TO INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS

The Idealized Process of Collaboration

It is no accident that imprecise and confusing terminology is found in services-coordination literature. With little attention to key differences in meaning, projects are interchangeably and variously labeled as efforts toward services coordination, integration, or collaboration. As far back as 1986, however, Hord suggested that there are significant differences in attributes and relationships between coordinative and collaborative arrangements. Much conflict can arise, she concluded, from the simple fact that the individuals involved in a project may be unclear as to *which* model (coordination or collaboration) represents the central expectation (Hord, 1986).

Table 2 summarizes some distinctions Hord (1986) made between the two models. In brief, she suggested that cooperative relationships tend to be greatly influenced by one organization (X), with less than fully comparable involvement and co-equality (resources, communications, leadership, etc.) on the part of another organization (Y). Collaborative relationships, on the other hand, involve fully linked services, and shared resources, expertise, communications, and control. The "product" under collaboration is not a service either X or Y would have provided alone.

Hord's (1986) comparison of cooperation and collaboration helps to clarify the confusion that continues today in establishing the structures of projects through an identifying terminology. Few children's services experiments across the nation, including the five profiled above, are definitively at the cooperative or collaborative ends of the continuum. Each falls somewhere in between.

Many of the projects to date utilize outside funding and an outside "convener" (e.g., a university). These projects typically introduce additional, noneducational services to schools and neighborhoods with the intent of *inducing* many of the processes and characteristics of collaboration identified by Hord (1986). They tend to go beyond the overinvolvement of organization X and minimal involvement of organization Y that is identified by Hord as "cooperation." However, these projects do not reach the shared sense of mission, mutuality, "product," communications, and expertise that Hord identified with "collaboration."

As an illustration, Chicago's Nation of Tomorrow project shows some of the problems accompanying these neither-cooperation-nor-collaboration structures, and points out some of the issues in attempting to move toward (or induce) collaboration. Smylie, Crowson, and Hare (1992) discovered the following, for example: First, the addition of new services to project schools in Chicago added considerably to the burdens felt by building principals, who saw themselves bearing greater responsibility and risk in their buildings and in their communities with insufficient direct control (in their estimation) over the new services. Second, school staff in the Chicago effort are well aware of the foundation-supported (and necessarily short-lived) source of project funds, finding in such a situation good reason to welcome added resources to their buildings but little reason to alter the school's mission and procedures or professional "mentalities." Third, nonschool partners in the Chicago effort (particularly, the cooperating university) evidence their own peculiarities of institutional structure and procedure, often meshing poorly with project objectives or operating procedures of public schools.

In short, the Nation of Tomorrow project in Chicago goes beyond cooperation as defined by Hord (1986) in forcing school staffs (particularly principals) to undergo changes necessary to face new ambiguities and weakened "control" over school/community activities. However, the project is also far from the ideal of collaboration Hord defined in that there has yet to be a merger of educator and other-service-provider "missions," and many institutional-structural barriers remain on the part of both organizations "X" and "Y." Smylie, Crowson, and Hare (1992) conclude in the Chicago case that:

> . . . despite the progress made in introducing activities and services that seem to be benefitting children and families, there has been little integration of the project into the daily functions of the schools. There has been little change in the structure or social

> organization of the schools. Little has been done to establish formal linkages and support systems for collaboration and service coordination. (p. 30)

Again, the Chicago case is not unique (similar findings were reported for the New Futures efforts (Cohen, 1991), and it is our sense that any discussion or development of approaches to children's services coordination/collaboration must acknowledge the fact that most projects are likely to fall well short of the collaborative ideal. This again raises the issue we broached in the introduction of this paper: To what extent, under what circumstances, and for what purposes is full collaboration desirable or necessary?

Gray and Wood (1991) have addressed this question and suggested the need for flexible theorizing that recognizes varieties of collaborative and near-collaborative alliances; comprehensively understands the *process* of collaboration from precondition to outcome; and appreciates important differences in the various interorganizational *domains* of collaboration. A domain of collaboration will reflect the special configuration of organizations in any particular project (e.g., schools, foundations, and universities; schools and corporate partners; schools and other city-service providers; public- and private-service providers).

The borderline existence (somewhere between cooperation and collaboration) of most children's services projects thus far suggests two key questions for further inquiry: (1) Just where is a project procedurally located on a continuum of cooperation to collaboration?; and (2) What evidence exists over time of movement either toward or away from collaboration? Many projects may show uneven progress and some continuing "struggles" among the various elements toward collaboration (e.g., improved communications linkages but little sense of mutual control). It may be out of a careful documentation of these struggles and various surrounding compromises that much added administrative understanding can evolve.

Towards An Understanding of Institutional Structures in Collaboration

To summarize briefly, the state of the art in children's services collaboration has typically not progressed to an idealized point in which participating organizations in projects share completely in the delivery of services, agree fully on goals and outcomes, contribute resources equally, share control and leadership, communicate and interact smoothly, and operate as "we" rather than "us/them."

Rather, it is much more likely that projects will be struggling with problems blending other services into the institutional dominion of the school, reaching a shared sense of mission and shared leadership/control in collaborative ventures, and building effective communicative linkages between the projects' array of service-providers (Crowson & Boyd, 1993).

On the other hand, the extant literature also suggests that many efforts in children's services collaboration may have successfully pushed beyond the minimal coordination stage as defined by Hord (1986). Organizations X and Y in most experiments are both providing resources and leadership. New staff roles are to be found; struggles toward an effective compromise in control and communications issues are typical; and, in most projects, there is at least a sense that a shared product--a product that extends well beyond the narrowly defined 3-R's role of the local school--is a worthy objective.

Indeed, in the Chicago case, an evaluation (Levin, 1991) elicited the following comments from teachers in project schools:

- "In formulating the after-school program, no class level was left out, no age group was treated as less important than another. Even the kindergarten was having input into what they were interested in, which was cultural things. Of course the health component is just marvelous. Having that and having a person who goes into the community and introduces herself to the parents and lets them know that there are services in the community that they can use helps them better manage their lives."
- "They spurred my thinking and desire to do more. We used our own creativity. We were like group leaders, not teachers. We shared and built it together. It was a group effort."
- "I, as an individual, am growing from it. I feel very hopeful that something can be done for these children."

The beyond-cooperation but not-quite-collaboration status of most experimentation to date is well recognized in the handbook and guidelines literature (see particularly, Bruner, 1991; Melaville & Blank, 1991; Blank, Melaville, & Asayesh, 1993). Nevertheless, it is our sense that while a thorough understanding of struggling-toward-collaboration *processes* is vitally important, it is also vital to understand, as thoroughly as possible, the complexities of *institutional structure* that come into play in collaborative ventures.

Thus, the remainder of this discussion works toward a better understanding of the interorganizational domains of collaboration. The focus is on the following key aspects of institutions under collaboration: (1) the convening process (the beginnings of a shared goal structure); (2) institutional interests and reward systems; (3) institutional environments; and (4) institutional conventions.

These four aspects of institutional collaboration, of course, do not capture the totality of the many organizational behaviors that are critically affected by collaboration. Our analysis tends to take a "structures" approach, following the theorizing of the "new institutionalism" school of organizational analysts (particularly March & Olsen, 1984, 1989; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991; and Wilson, 1989). From a social-psychological perspective, we continue to neglect some important issues for collaboration in

professional socialization, administrative leadership, group dynamics, and bargaining/negotiating. These are recognizably important, as indicated in our review of the coordinated services literature (Crowson & Boyd, 1993).

For heuristic reasons, as in our treatment of coordination-to-collaboration as a potential continuum, we suggest that each of our four institutional structures can be usefully conceived in similar "continuum" terms. This notion is summarized in Table 3 in which, quite simply, the suggestion is that institutions effectively moving toward children's services collaboration will begin to give evidence of passing well beyond some "preconditions" in the convening process and will give some evidence of shared institutional interests, environmental adaptations, and institutional conventions. Each of the institutional structures is discussed briefly below, with data from the case studies and some key research questions.

1. Institutions and the Convening (Goal Structuring) Process

Wood and Gray (1991) suggest that any of a number of institutional "preconditions" are necessary for collaboration to occur. These may range from a developing sense of shared resource dependence, to a sense of increased efficiency or cost reduction through collaboration, to a reconceptualization of the "central problem" facing a domain of organizations which motivates collaboration (Wood & Gray, 1991).

Some attention has been given to the goal of increased efficiency in discussions of coordinating children's services, particularly with regard to initiatives at the state level. But little evidence of greater efficiency or cost reduction exists to date as a realistic outcome (see Useem, 1991).

Similarly, there is little evidence thus far of children's services collaboration that grows out of a sense of resource dependency; that is, institutions competing for the same resources attempt to share their mutual "stake" in that base. Indeed, much of the children's services experimentation to date has involved add-ons of extra resources (e.g., from foundations, universities, or corporations) rather than efforts toward a direct sharing of a common base. The effect of this sidecar funding places the struggle toward collaboration within a weakened and short-lived framework.

By far, the most common of the "preconditions" in the literature on coordinated children's services has been a growing reconceptualization of the "central problem" of educating an urban population. In earlier work (Crowson & Boyd, 1993), this was summarized as: (a) a renewed sense of the ecological interdependencies between schools, families, and neighborhoods; (b) a recognition that effective investments in education require complementary investments in children's health, nutrition, family stability, housing, and the social capital of the community; and (c) a renewed sense of the vital

child-development role of the school in blending academics into the social, moral, and emotional development of children.

Although evidence of lengthy discussion among project participants is seldom seen, indications of such conceptualizations of "the problem" are present in four of the five projects profiled earlier:

- The Minneapolis Youth Trust offers its partnerships as "a long-term commitment to the human resource development of Minneapolis youth" (Scannapieco, 1992, p. 2).
- Houston's School of the Future recognizes that family, neighborhood, school, and community service resources "must come together as a working system if they are to be responsive and effective in addressing the challenges for optimal development" of children (Arvey & Tijerina, 1992, p. 7).
- Chicago's Nation of Tomorrow talks about "enhancing the capacities of and functional relationships among multiple institutions with which children interact from early childhood through at least early adolescence" (Smylie, Crowson, & Hare, 1992).
- The Murchison Street School Family Service Center (East Los Angeles) discusses "an integrated client-centered approach for dealing with the multiple problems of inner-city students" (Bilovsky & Zetlin, 1992).

Despite these statements of a central problem behind their collaboration, there is some evidence that many projects find it difficult to build from the precondition of a reconceptualized problem into the sharing (of goals or missions) that characterizes a convening process. Evidence of such a process, Wood and Gray (1991) claim, is to be found when participants actively orient their discussions, decisions, and actions around the "problem domain" that brought them together in the first place.

In a project pursuing a public schools and business partnership toward "the human resource development of Minneapolis youth," for example, some feedback (Johnson, 1992) followed:

- "Getting the partnership off the ground was harder than expected. There were communication barriers along with different work styles, values, and objectives. They don't always match between the two groups. Even the two calendars are so different" (p. 3).
- "The teachers are very hard to stay in touch with. They have short work hours and are usually in the class. They don't have voice mail, which would make our interaction a whole lot easier! For now, we will begin using fax machines more" (p. 3).
- "I am not convinced that partnerships are the way to go. They seem to be a last-minute effort to save our education system--like an emergency room. The problem is very deep. We are willing to take part, but we have to ask ourselves, 'Why are we doing it?'" (p. 8).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Similarly, in Chicago's Nation of Tomorrow project, the conveners, whose goal it was to strengthen relationships among multiple institutions serving children, encountered some of the following difficulties (Levin, 1992):

- A number of respondents feel that there is a conflict between expectations of the Nation of Tomorrow as a project to support the ongoing activities of the school, versus a project which has its own set of activities.
- Participants spoke of a continuing problem of school personnel expecting Nation of Tomorrow staff members to function within the traditional school employee model, with far more supervision and less freedom to come and go as they please.
- The [school] administration does not understand the role of family advocates. They generally see them as social workers, as people to come in when there's a crisis. They don't see them as proactive persons, persons who prevent.

In sum, our theorizing suggests that a key task in moving institutional structures toward collaboration involves success in negotiating a "convening process," a process that may involve some preconditions (particularly the sense of a shared central problem), followed by some progress toward shared goals in addressing the problem. Among the many questions to be asked in further inquiry into the convening process in children's services projects are: (a) To what extent do project participants across cooperating institutions share a sense of the "common problem?"; (b) To what degree is there evidence, over time in ongoing projects, of progress toward a cross-institutional sharing of goals or missions?; and (c) What are some identifiable characteristics of projects that have moved well along a continuum toward a shared sense of goals (e.g., lengthy planning time; explicit written agreements; strong, goal-oriented leadership)?

2. Institutional Interests/Reward Systems

In a classically simple and insightful statement, Edward Banfield (1970) once observed that most political issues arise out of the maintenance and enhancement needs of large formal organizations. In the case of public schooling, such needs can revolve around key institutional interests in protecting jobs, budgets, programs, facilities, turf, and enrollments.

Such interests are usually very closely tied to an institutional reward system. Thus, it is not at all difficult to understand the findings of Morris, Crowson, Porter-Gehrie, & Hurwitz, Jr. (1984) in their study of the Chicago Public Schools: active student "headhunting" engaged in by school principals in an enrollment-driven system of resource allocation and efforts to maintain tight "order" in schools in a system heavily critical of publicity-generating disorder.

Each of the institutional members of a collaborative will bring to the partnership a set of interests rooted in its own reward system. It is principally for this reason that some theorists are wary of school-*based* children's services programs, and instead favor school-*linked* efforts (Behrman, 1992). The argument is that the reward system of the school system will tend to dominate in a school-based endeavor. For the same reason, Kirst (1991) stresses the importance of "glue money" if separate agencies are to be attracted toward partnered services to the same children. The challenges in finding a bit of "glue" are evident in the research literature, which now contains numerous examples of institutional reward systems that pull partners in opposite directions and away from the complementary impact on children that was intended (Crowson & Boyd, 1993).

Institutional interests and the underlying reward system often can be a central part of the "hidden curriculum" of a project, not easily unearthed except through careful, on-site observation. Examples can be drawn from some fieldwork accompanying Chicago's Nation of Tomorrow project, reported by Crowson, Smylie, and Hare (1992), Smylie, Crowson, and Hare (1992), and Levin (1991, 1992).

First, this experiment has wrestled mightily with a structure for project governance that apparently fails to fit adequately into the schools' system of rewards for administrative control. An array of new personnel and school-linked roles have been added by the experiment to each project school--from family advocates, to family health-care experts, to community-services personnel, to school-improvement consultants. Each school site has received the services of a project coordinator as a "unification" specialist.

Not adequately considered, however, has been an institutional reward system that places full responsibility for anything "gone wrong" at the school site on the shoulders of the building principal. The building principal has traditionally been rewarded for remaining fully in control of his or her school, an incentive of even greater saliency under a reform law in Chicago that places the principal's tenure in the hands of each local school council.

Consequently, principals have felt constrained in the Chicago experiment to reach strenuously toward added control of a school site that (under its children's services experimentation) is facing new dimensions of program complexity and ambiguity. Some early feedback has been that:

> "It isn't clear that the schools have each become completely reconciled to all the new actors--to all the new things going on. There may be a sense to some of the principals of activities out-of-control, balanced against their sense of much greater responsibility for it all" (Crowson, Smylie, & Hare, 1992, p. 11).

Or, as one principal commented:

> "I really feel like I'm running two schools. I've got the entire school to run and then this project over here on the side that I'm trying to move . . . I'm taking my time from what I could be doing in the school to do it" (Smylie, Crowson, & Hare, 1992, p. 23).

Second, the Chicago experiment has yet to resolve some key issues in a blending of the institutional interests of its major partners. The University of Illinois, as a key partner, has tended to bring persons to the experiment (faculty and staff members) with extremely flexible time schedules; research and scholarship interests; philosophies of change; respect for worklife autonomy; and a general preference for nondirective and nonhierarchical styles of intervention.

By contrast, as partners, the schools have tended to bring to the experiment severe resource needs; inflexible schedules and time limitations; a teacher-and-pupil classroom orientation; and an administrator-directive style of management. It has been in the interest of the project schools, furthermore, to access the experiment's (foundation-provided) resources as an add-on to the continuing work of the school; but it has been in the interest of the University to utilize the experiment's resources as a bit of school-change leverage.

The strains between interests are reflected in some reaction from project participants. One site coordinator observed:

> "Most school people have never worked independently like we are supposed to do. They [the principals] want someone to watch over our every move. They want us to report to someone as if we are in the military" (Levin, 1992).

A family advocate (a person in an outreach-to-the-community role) noted:

> "The project has been absorbed by the school. We are becoming more and more school personnel. We are extra bodies" (Smylie, Crowson, & Hare, 1992, p. 20).

Similarly, a University faculty member concluded:

> "There's a continuing problem of school personnel expecting Nation of Tomorrow staff members to function within the traditional school employee model, with far more supervision and less freedom to come and go as they please" (Levin, 1992).

In sum, each institution in a collaborative will have many self-interests. These will be rooted in institutional reward systems--systems that can be significantly challenged by the process of collaborating and by encounters with the reward systems of partnering organizations. While it would be highly unlikely to expect cooperating institutions to change their own reward structures fundamentally, movements toward successful institutional collaboration should show progress toward some shared interests and rewards--sufficient to override the "pulling" of separate institutional interests. Among the key questions to be asked are: (a) What identifiably separate institutional interests and reward structures

can be noted in a project among the active institutional "players?"; (b) To what degree can evidence be found, over time, of some common interests in and rewards for collaboration in a project?; and (c) What are the observable effects upon a collaborative project of clashing interests between a "home" organization and its collaborating unit(s)?

3. Institutional Environmental Control

In discussing the development of the School of the Future effort in a Houston middle school, Arvey and Tijerina (1992) note that a "negative community image" of the school was one of the "primary concerns" of project staff. Community memories of a particularly violent incident some 5 years earlier were still being reflected in parental decisions to send their children to magnet and private schools rather than to this neighborhood institution. It was hoped that this negative image could now be changed. Additionally, the project developers sought to address some perceived deficits in community resources in the neighborhoods served by all three of the project schools--particularly the lack of organized activities for children, of places for children to play, and of readily accessible medical clinics or other health care providers in the neighborhoods.

A somewhat different relationship with the community surrounds the Family Service Center effort at the Murchison Street School in East Los Angeles. There, one of the central goals is to effectively strengthen the link between school resources and an array of fragmented services in the community, specifically health, mental health, social welfare, and juvenile justice.

Each of these projects is consistent with philosophies of children's services coordination that stress the importance of school outreach as investments in the "social capital" of their neighborhoods (Coleman, 1988a, 1988b) and/or as recognition of the necessary developmental linkage between education and a range of other complementary social services. Each of these projects is also consistent with a major redefinition of the relationship between the local school and its neighborhood environment--a goal that is now a central tenet of the children's services coordination movement (see Crowson, 1992).

In short, under children's services coordination, both schools and other-services agencies are hard pressed to become newly "environmentalized" (Trist, 1977). Despite a history of other-services provision (e.g., school lunches, medical and dental inspections, guidance) with solid roots in the turn-of-the-century era of Progressive reform, public schools have not been regarded as overly "open" institutions. Indeed, Tyack (1992) argues that school systems have been adept over time at transforming such other-services innovations into "smoothly running parts of the *pedagogical* machinery" (p. 25).

Trist (1977) and, more recently, Gray (1991) observe that institutions acting independently but sharing a common "field" (e.g., providing similar or overlapping services, sharing a clientele, drawing on the same resource base) can add considerably to the "turbulence" of one another's environments. Such turbulence can lead to added recognition of institutional interdependence, but also to much higher levels of both shared and individual uncertainty (Trist, 1977).

Trist's (1977) point is that as the public schools and other social service providers join forces in a given community as cooperating institutions, they are engaging together in a renewed "environmentalization" of their organizational structures. Consequently, they may be engaged in raising their levels of institutional turbulence and uncertainty by a considerable degree.

A public school that confines itself to the 3 R's and follows old dictates of "closedness" to parent/community involvement inhabits an environmental "niche" all its own. But a public school that shares space with the parks department, operates an on-site community health clinic, sends social workers out into the neighborhood, opens its doors to parents and volunteers, offers after-school tutoring and recreation, and liaises with the local library, finds itself in an environment of much finer complexity. Not only do school rules and regulations, in this case, define its professional lifespace, but health, recreation, social work, and library rules must henceforth be considered as well. In this instance, not only does a politics of schooling characterize its activities, but politics of other professions and the neighborhood also become defining characteristics of the school's institutional persona.

In the most recent of the handbooks written for those who would undertake coordinated services experimentation (e.g., *Together We Can*, by Blank, Melaville, and Asayesh, 1993), the added environmentalization that can accompany collaborative ventures is fully recognized. With political astuteness, the authors urge that: (a) care be taken to bring *all* of the stakeholders fully into a partnership; (b) a "web of alliances" be developed; (c) written agreements between partners be carefully negotiated and formalized; and (d) an information/governance plan be sure to reach decision makers of all levels of authority (Blank, Melaville, & Asayesh, 1993).

Nevertheless, the effective accommodation of the new environmentalization of partnering institutions under services coordination remains a central issue. First, there is evidence, per Tyack's (1992) historical observation, that projects to date have encountered a tendency by educators to "institutionalize" services coordination under education's pedagogical persona.

For example, in a study of British experimentation Johnson, Ransom, Packwood, Bowden, & Kogan (1980) report that after nearly two decades of a British amalgamation of children's welfare, health, and education services, "long-standing issues such as the ways that teachers, education welfare officers,

social workers, and other supporting services worked together were unresolved" (p. 1). Furthermore, teachers in the British experiment--accustomed to thinking of children in classroom lots and to maintaining a sense of boundary between school, home, and other-service agencies--had great difficulty in reconceptualizing their roles in more "pastoral" or care-giving terms and in valuing the work of other-service professionals as highly as their own (pp. 95-97).

The most clear-cut example from field records of a struggle over the educational institutionalization of a children's services endeavor comes from the work of Mickelson, Yon, and Carlton-LaNey (1992) in describing A Child's Place. The authors note that the initial director was a professional educator who:

> . . . was a stern disciplinarian [and] believed that her role as teacher was part of her "ministry"; that it was God's will that she teach these homeless children. She also believed that the children needed to be taught that there were consequences for their actions because "the reason they were homeless was that their parents had never learned that lesson." (p. 17)

A replacement director saw the role more in terms of coordinating services, but the result was a loss of attention and an estrangement from the program's pedagogical players. Mickelson, Yon, and Carlton-LaNey (1992) conclude that the tension between the social service staff and the educational staff persists.

Likewise, in an examination of the Nation of Tomorrow project in Chicago, Smylie, Crowson, and Hare (1992) observe that:

> . . . project participants have observed that a number of the "school people" have had difficulty "getting their heads around" the project's philosophy, and have had difficulty reconceptualizing the work of the school in terms that go beyond classroom instruction within the school's "four walls." As an example, there were reportedly some strains in the health services component of the project when added nursing resources were interpreted by school personnel as new (but traditional) school-nurse resources. The newly added nurse-professionals themselves, however, saw their responsibilities as proactively "bringing the community in" as part of a "community model" of school nursing. (pp. 13-14)

Second, there is often evidence of an unresolved placement of environmental fallout in back-and-forth negotiations between key institutional partners in children's services coordination. In our first example above, drawn from Tyack (1992), the suggestion was that institutions--often schools--can try to redirect environmental turbulence and bring it under control within their own orbits. Here, the suggestion is that new conflict-ridden domains of environmental turbulence can be raised.

In the literature, perhaps no aspect of collaboration illustrates this second condition quite as well as the issue of confidentiality of information. There are real and important considerations among service

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

providers in the sharing and pooling of information about children and families. For good reason, confidentiality restrictions are well rooted in Constitutional guarantees of personal privacy, and in statutory provisions as well as in the ethical standards of the differing professions. This exists despite equally good reasons why shared information is vital for continuity in children's services delivery and more efficient and effective use of child-assistance resources (see Behrman, 1992; Kahne & Kelley, 1991; Joining Forces, 1992).

Family consent agreements and release forms, plus careful guidelines on security of access and data parameters allowed in automated information systems, are among the proposed solutions. Nevertheless, the more critical deep-structure issues between cooperating institutions go beyond release forms to environmental turbulence issues of a feared loss of turf control, a distrust of other professionals' use of "our" information, and sets of ethical and legal concerns (including fears of lawsuits) when information leaves any of a number of traditionally tightly closed systems. Indeed, information on their clients constitutes the most significant of "property rights" held by each of the professions. Property rights protect the very basic value of a service or commodity that one has available for exchange (see Demsetz, 1967).

A direct example of the environmental threat to established property rights is provided in the Crowson, Smylie, and Hare (1992) examination of Chicago's Nation of Tomorrow project. In this example, a provision of the children's services project results in environmental tension for the employment services arm (civil service) of the project's partnering university. The authors write:

> One of the most innovative and well received of the project components involves the direct employment of persons from the communities surrounding each project school. These community representatives, with training, engage in a variety of "outreach" activities with parents as part of the project's "family-ties" component. The activities range from running tutoring and training programs, to offering information about child care and child development, working with latchkey children, helping parents find jobs, offering language (bilingual) assistance, and being a friend and resource to parents, one-on-one.
>
> The community representatives are paid on a full-time basis by the University at a "civil-service" level commensurate with their formal experience and qualifications. The resulting civil service pay rate is exceedingly low, at the bottom of civil service categorizations. It is considered an embarrassment to project officers and is reportedly a source of tension with the recipients of these wages--for the representatives feel undervalued and overworked [in comparison to the pay and work of school personnel]. Thus, the seemingly simple and straightforward (and presumably non-risky) task of paying the people who work on a project (at an established rate) finds the stable arrangements of a civil service system apparently unadapted to project needs (pp. 16-17).

In sum, children's services collaboration raises additional environmental issues for each of its institutional partners. There is a tendency for one or more partners to attempt to "institutionalize" the resulting environmental turbulence within its ongoing structures (e.g., to pedagogize services coordination or to use an unaltered civil-service system). There also can be a tendency for environmental turbulence to lead to and reflect a loss of environmental control among the partnering institutions, with conflicts which may or may not be resolved in a newly shared "environmentalization." Among the key questions to be asked in further inquiry are: (a) What evidence of environmental tensions, or "turbulence," is to be found in ongoing children's services coordination projects?; and (b) What evidence can be found of efforts to incorporate environmental issues into ongoing institutional structures versus creating newly shared structures of collaborative environmental control?

4. Institutional Conventions

Institutions serve an extremely important function for those who work within them--the function of imposing elements of order upon what might otherwise be an extremely ambiguous and, in the terminology of March and Olsen (1984), "potentially inchoate world" (p. 743). An institution's special "order" is to be found in its unique history, its allocations of time, the management of its external environment, its normative structures, its special demographic characteristics, and its symbolic behavior (e.g., its ceremonies, stories, and rituals (March & Olsen, 1984).

It would not be inconceivable for each of the partners in a children's services cooperative to bring to the partnership a near-fundamental difference in institutional order. Compare, for example, some of the conventions of health care institutions (especially hospitals) with those of public schools. Increasingly, visitors in hospitals are recognized as valuable elements in the healing process. Although there are often sign-in procedures and visiting hours, these rules with frequency, loosely observed. Increasingly, close family visitors are increasingly permitted to stay overnight, and quasi-nursing roles are often allowed for them. By contrast, though the public schools are surely a bit more welcoming than in years past, and some (often tutorial) roles are now granted to frequent visitors, the visitor in education is still not typically regarded as integral to the learning process; the "Visitors Report to the Office" sign is still taken seriously. Some other key differences in conventions include:

1. The hospital summons its best, organizes itself around, and coalesces its resources for crises (emergencies). The public school typically seeks to avoid any hint or a charge of a crisis--a term best avoided in the greater interest of long-term development.

2. The hospital uses "pull out," specialist services as an integral part of a diagnosis and "whole" recovery for each patient. Despite the IEP (Individualized Educational Plan) tradition from special education, the public school tends to fragment its professional services. Moreover, regular classroom teachers often resent the "pull out" work of specialists as time lost to what they regard as the "real work" of the institution.

3. In health care, the most important people are not necessarily those who "live" occupationally in the human-service institution. Many persons, especially physicians, use the institution as a base but have a practice (and spend much of their day) elsewhere. In public schools, the most important people do "live" in the institution, and are closely tied (careerwise, psychologically, etc.) to the day-to-day affairs of the organization. In the first case, primary loyalties to the organization may be less important to effective service-provision than in the second.

4. In health care, there is frequently much more procedure, ritual, rule-following, and care taken at the "intake" end of service provision than at the service-leaving or "release" end. In public education, clients are not released; rather, their completion of program at the "out-take" end is specially celebrated, often with close friends and relatives joining in an often large-scale assembly. In the first instance, emphasis is on preparation for service, with client diagnosis and needs primary; in the second instance, the emphasis is on evidence that the client has met the institution's standards for performance.

Key differences in the daily drama of public-service institutions are also found between public schools and criminal justice; public housing; parks and recreation; child-protection; and family assistance institutions (see Lipsky, 1980). Again, these differences are a central part of the distinct order of each institution.

There has been some recognition in the children's services literature, particularly by Gardner (1992), and Kahne and Kelley (1991), that the tensions emanating from the comparative institutional conventions of cooperating organizations can be of serious concern. Nevertheless, there has been relatively little in-depth investigation into the problems of (and issues in) bridging these potentially noncompatible institutional structures, even when, in many cases, a change in convention is central to the very philosophy of services coordination.

For example, one of the central tenets of coordinated-services improvement is the recognition that the timing of services to families is currently far from optimal. Earlier interventions might prevent later crises. Yet, the system of queuing that currently exists in many service arenas often results in the development of crises before special services are provided (Melaville & Blank, 1991; Larson, et al., 1992). Interestingly, in response, schools in inner-city environments have increasingly lengthened the school day, year, and even week. For example, many schools are now open both earlier and later in the

day, into summer, and on Saturdays. The age at which children begin school has also been extended downward into the "child-care" years. These alterations result in a new stress on the child-development role of the school.

Despite the push toward school-based and school-linked coordination, the timing of needed services for children and families generally conforms poorly to education schedules. Late nights, weekends, and hot summers are often times of greatest need. Services provided at these times often do have a crisis origin, but out of crisis may also come a receptivity to prevention. The timing of a child-development and prevention orientation is a far cry from the timing of a services orientation that must be there as events unfold, respond quickly and comprehensively to needs, and be as effectively reactive as proactive.

Some meaningful differences in convention between participating institutions can be seen in the projects under review for this report. Excerpts from interviews with both business and educator participants in the Minneapolis Youth Trust, for example, give a flavor of the barriers to cooperation in educator versus business lifeways (Johnson, 1992):

- "Getting the partnership off the ground was harder than expected. There were communication barriers along with different work styles, values, and objectives. They don't always match between the two groups. Even the two calendars are so different." (p. 3)
- "We've had a hard time setting meetings. The partnership involves a lot of busy people. Currently, we don't have regular meetings." (p. 3)
- "Employees tend to be too busy to commit to a weekly time. We need to be more creative to see how we can better work with time constraints." (p. 4)
- "Teachers are overwhelmed. Meetings are back to back with classes and teachers often come in 'frazzled,' not ready to switch gears." (p. 4)
- "Businesses lack the awareness about what is meaningful in the lives of children at different ages. This is a barrier to planning activities." (p. 6)
- "Teachers are not used to running meetings efficiently, keeping on task." (p. 6)

Houston's School of the Future project has placed a very heavy emphasis on the involvement of parents as one key group of project "partners." Highlights from a report by Arvey and Tijerina (1992) indicate that differences in convention between school and community can also be imposing barriers:

- One incident that really brought home the differences in the expectations of planners and the experience of the people affected was the first partnership luncheon. Our parent representative, a woman actively involved for the past 5 years in her children's school and a perceived leader among parents, had never before attended a "luncheon." (p. 26)

- . . . parents had no indication of what was expected. There were strong cultural norms that made it difficult for a woman to feel comfortable in a leadership role outside the home. The very language--organization, procedures, goals, objectives, priorities, planning, motions, and consensus--was not within the language or experience of these parents. Even when schools provided babysitters and stipends for child care or transportation, women did not participate. (p. 25)

In summary, daily life in every institution has a special rhythm. The rhythms of an institution's behavior are reflected in its use of time, in the "queuing" or time-processing of its clients, and in the time constraints that develop around the activities of its inhabitants. Institutional rhythms are also reflected in the various conventions that together help to establish each institution's sense of order, including such elements as: what institutions separately "celebrate"; what they consider vital to getting a job done (e.g., efficient, on-task meetings versus time alone to plan and prepare); what discourse language is used to describe the work of the institution; and what expectations of behavior/performance surround those who serve and are served by the institution.

Institutional conventions can be so fully integrated into work lives that they seem "natural." Thus, it may not be readily apparent that use of the word "luncheon" can be a barrier to school-community relations or that the less-than-efficient and only vaguely task-oriented meetings of educators can be frustrating to partnering businesspeople. Among the key questions which emerge in this arena of institutional-structure concerns are: (a) What identifiably separate institutional "conventions" of possible importance to collaboration can be noted among the partners in ongoing services-coordination projects?; (b) Is there evidence in the ongoing projects of separate institutional conventions that are in some degree of conflict with collaboration?; and (c) To what extent is there evidence of a coming-together of differences in institutional conventions under collaboration?

CONCLUSION

Table 4 succinctly summarizes the theoretical framework we suggest as a guide to further inquiry. Every experiment in children's services coordination can be examined first as a point along a *process* continuum, from little-to-no integration of services to a collaborative ideal, and then as an exercise in the impact of institutional *structures* upon the administrative effort.

Most experiments to date have achieved some success toward collaboration, but few have progressed to any noticeable degree toward the "ideal." The determinants and characteristics of progress on the process dimension of collaboration are still underexplored terrain, as is the question of the extent to, and the circumstances under which, full collaboration is desirable or necessary.

While many institutional characteristics may be of importance to a structural analysis, our review suggests that four are essential: (1) goal structures; (2) institutional interests; (3) environmental controls; and (4) institutional conventions. Significantly, these are among the elements described by Sarason (1990) as the most "intractable" of organizational characteristics in school reform. Every venture in children's services coordination is likely to struggle informatively (and often creatively) with issues crucial to our knowledge base in moving from institutionally *distinct* structures toward those that are institutionally *shared*.

REFERENCES

Arvey, H. H., & Tijerina, A. (1992, October). The School of the Future: Implementation issues in a school/community connection. Paper presented at "School/Community Connections: Exploring Issues for Research and Practice," an invitational conference. Washington, DC: National Center on Education in the Inner Cities.

Banfield, E. C. (1970). The unheavenly city. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Behrman, R. E. (Ed.). (1992). School-linked services. The Future of Children, 2(1).

Bilovsky, R., & Zetlin, A. (1992). CSLA-Murchison School Partnership Family Service Center. Unpublished project description, School of Education, California State University at Los Angeles.

Blank, M. J., Melaville, A. I., & Asayesh, G. (1993). Together we can: A guide to crafting community-based family-centered strategies for integrating education and human services. Washington, DC: Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI).

Boyd, W. L., & Crowson, R. L. (1992, October). Integration of services for children: A political economy of institutions perspective. Paper presented at "School/Community Connections: Exploring Issues for Research and Practice," an invitational conference. Washington, DC: National Center on Education in the Inner Cities.

Bruner, C. (1991, April). Thinking collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services. Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium.

Chaskin, R. J., & Richman, H. A. (1992). Concerns about school-linked services: Institution-based versus community-based models. In R. E. Behrman (Ed.), The Future of Children, 2(1), 107-117.

Cohen, D. L. (1991, September 25). Reality tempers "new futures" optimism. Education Week, 9(4), 1, 12-15.

Coleman, J. S. (1988a). Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal of Sociology, 94(Suppl. S95-S120).

Coleman, J. S. (1988b, April). Statement before the Select Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives. Washington, DC.

Crowson, R. L. (1992). School-community relations: Under reform. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1993). Coordinated services for children: Designing arks for storms and seas unknown. American Journal of Education, 101(2), 140-179.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Crowson, R. L., Smylie, M. A., & Hare, V. C. (1992, April). Administrative issues in coordinated children's services: A Chicago case study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), San Francisco.

Demsetz, H. (1967). Towards a theory of property rights. American Economic Review, 57, 347-359.

Dolan, L. J. (1992, October). An evaluation of social service integration within six elementary schools in Baltimore. Paper presented at "School/Community Connections: Exploring Issues for Research and Practice," an invitational conference. Washington, DC: National Center on Education in the Inner Cities.

Dunbar, B. J. (1991, September). The Nation of Tomorrow: Application to the Business-Higher Education Forum for the 1991 Anderson Medal. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois at Chicago, Center for Research in Urban Education.

Gardner, S. L. (1992). Key issues in developing school-linked integrated services. In R. E. Behrman (Ed.), The Future of Children, 2(1), 85-94.

Gray, B. (1991). Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gray, B., & Wood, D. J. (1991). Collaborative alliances: Moving from practice to theory. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science [Special issue entitled, "Collaborative Alliances: Moving from Practice to Theory"], 27(1 and 2).

Hord, S. M. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 22-26.

Intriligator, B. A. (1992, October 31). Designing effective inter-organizational networks. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), Minneapolis.

Joining Forces. (1992). Confidentiality and collaboration: Information sharing in interagency efforts. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Johnson, D., Ransom, E., Packwood, T., Bowden, K., & Kogan, M. (1980). Secondary schools and the welfare network. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Johnson, M. (1992). Emerging themes from interviews with twenty Minneapolis school-business partnerships, Winter and Spring, 1992. Minneapolis: Minneapolis Youth Trust.

Kahne, J., & Kelley, C. (1991, October). Assessing the coordination of children's services: An organizational approach. Unpublished paper, Stanford University School of Education.

Kirst, M. W. (1991). Improving children's services: Overcoming barriers, creating new opportunities. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(8), 615-618.

Levin, R. (1991). University and elementary school faculty interview summary, Nation of Tomorrow project. Unpublished report, Center for Urban Education Research and Development, College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Levin, R. (1992). Interviews with project participants, the Nation of Tomorrow project. Unpublished report, Center for Urban Education Research and Development, College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1984). The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life. American Political Science Review, 78(3), 734-749.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1989). Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics. New York, NY: Free Press.

Melaville, A. I, & Blank, M. J. (1991, January). What it takes: Structuring interagency partnerships to connect children and families with comprehensive services. Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium.

Mickelson, R. A., Yon, M., & Carlton-LaNey, I. (1992, October). Slipping through the cracks: The education of homeless children. Paper presented at "School/Community Connections: Exploring Issues for Research and Practice," an invitational conference. Washington, DC: National Center on Education in the Inner Cities.

Morris, V. C., Crowson, R. L., Porter-Gehrie, C., & Hurwitz, E., Jr. (1984). Principals in action: The reality of managing schools. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Payzant, T. W. (1992). New beginnings in San Diego: Developing a strategy for interagency collaboration. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(2), 139-146.

Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (Eds.). (1991). The new institutionalism in organizational analysis. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Scannapieco, M. (1992). Project 3.3: School-community programs: Minneapolis Youth Trust. A field report to the National Center for Education in the Inner Cities, Philadelphia, PA.

Smylie, M. A., Crowson, R. L., & Hare, V. C. (1992, October). The principal and school-level administration of coordinated children's services. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), Minneapolis, MN.

Trist, E. (1977). Collaboration in work settings: A personal perspective. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13(3), 268-278.

Tyack, D. (1992). Health and social services in public schools: Historical perspectives. In R. E. Behrman (Ed.), The Future of Children, 2(1), 19-31.

Useem, E. L. (1991, April). What a difference a recession makes: The rise and fall of integrated services for at-risk youth in Massachusetts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Chicago, IL.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1992, October). The effectiveness of collaborative school-linked services. Paper presented at "School/Community Connections: Exploring Issues for Research and Practice," an invitational conference. Washington, DC: National Center on Education in the Inner Cities.

Wehlage, G., Smith, G., & Lipman, P. (1992, Spring). Restructuring urban schools: The new futures experience. American Educational Research Journal, 29(1), 55-96.

Wilson, J. Q. (1989). Bureaucracy: What government agencies do and why they do it. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Wood, D. J., & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(2).

Zetlin, A., & Bilovsky, R. (1992, September). Integrated services center links school, family, and community. The CEIC Review, pp. 6-7.

TABLE 1

CASE-COMPARATIVE STRUCTURES OF COLLABORATION

	Convening Organization	Institutional Focus	Extensiveness of Planned Collaboration
Minneapolis Youth Trust	Mayor's Office	Selected schools, city-wide	Added services for participating schools
Nation of Tommorow (Chicago)	Area University	Four inner-city schools	Simultaneous emphasis on children's services & school/ instructional improvement
School of the Future (Houston)	Foundation/School District Partnership	Three central-city schools	Integration of health/human services into the school mission
Family Service Center (East Los Angeles)	Area University/School Partnership	A central-city school	Services at the school site for children & families, plus goal of improved student achievement
A Child's Place (Charlotte)	Private Social Service Providers	A school-based center for a special clientele	Unresolved conflict in mission between social services & education

TABLE 2

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION*

	Cooperation Model		Collaboration Model
	Convening or beginning processes		
1.	Organization X approaches organization Y for assistance, tolerance, and cooperation in completing a task. Minimal contribution of resources is expected from Y. X completes the task (develops a "product") as a result of cooperation with Y.	1.	Organizations X and Y agree on a shared product or service, and join forces to plan/execute it. Organizations agree on goals and on projected results or outcomes.
	Institutional focus/ownership		
2.	X provides resources and expertise; Y provides access and setting. X often arranges funds and may pay Y for contributions.	2.	Both organizations contribute staff, resources, and capabilities. Mutual funding is obtained.
3.	Control continues to be lodged separately in each organization; leadership from one of the organizations is characteristic.	3.	Shared, mutual control develops; dispersed or delegated leadership is characteristic.
	Process requirement/characteristics		
4.	X determines the nature of communication, conveys information to Y, and responds to requests from Y.	4.	Communication interactions and roles are established; channels and "level" of communication are clarified.
5.	X undertakes the bulk of the project's activity with permission from Y.	5.	Both organizations spend time and energy. Expertise/action is contributed by each side. A combined staff comes into being; trade-offs are arranged.
6.	An "us/them" process mode develops.	6.	A "we" process mode develops.
	Product		
7.	A product or service is essentially produced by X, but Y may be able to use it and may benefit from it.	7.	A shared product or service emerges, one not possible if X and Y had approached the task as separate agents.

*Adapted from: Hord, S. M. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration (Figure 1). Educational Leadership, 43(5), 24-25.

TABLE 3

INSTITUTIONAL CONTINUA TOWARDS CHILDREN'S SERVICES COLLABORATION

1. Institutions and the Convening Process

   From Preconditions ----------> to the Convening Process

2. Institutional Interests

   From Institutionally Separate Interests ----------> to Shared Collaborative Interests

3. Environmental Control

   From Institutionally Separate Environmentalization ----------> to Shared Environmentalization

4. Institutional Conventions

   From Institutionally Separate Conventions ----------> to Shared Collaborative Conventions

TABLE 4

STRUCTURES AND STRATEGIES: TOWARD AN ANALYSIS OF ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES & ALTERNATIVES IN CHILDREN'S SERVICES COLLABORATION

The Institutional Structures Dimension	The Process Dimension: Separate Institutional Service Provision	The Process Dimension: Institutionally Collaborative Service Provision
Goal Structures	Minimal agreement on nature of the "problem"	Shared sense of problem & shared goals
Institutional Interests	Institutionally self-interested	Common institutional interests & merged reward structures
Environmental Controls	Independent environmental accommodations	Interdependent environmental accommodations
Institutional Conventions	Identifiably distinct conventions	Blended or shared institutional conventions

THE NATIONAL CENTER ON EDUCATION IN THE INNER CITIES

The National Center on Education in the Inner Cities (CEIC) was established on November 1, 1990 by the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE) in collaboration with the University of Illinois at Chicago and the University of Houston. CEIC is guided by a mission to conduct a program of research and development that seeks to improve the capacity for education in the inner cities.

A major premise of the work of CEIC is that the challenges facing today's children, youth, and families stem from a variety of political and health pressures; their solutions are by nature complex and require long-term programs of study that apply knowledge and expertise from many disciplines and professions. While not forgetting for a moment the risks, complexity, and history of the urban plight, CEIC aims to build on the resilience and "positives" of inner-city life in a program of research and development that takes bold steps to address the question, "What conditions are required to cause massive improvements in the learning and achievement of children and youth in this nation's inner cities?" This question provides the framework for the intersection of various CEIC projects/studies into a coherent program of research and development.

Grounded in theory, research, and practical know-how, the interdisciplinary teams of CEIC researchers engage in studies of exemplary practices as well as primary research that includes longitudinal studies and field-based experiments. CEIC is organized into four programs: three research and development programs and a program for dissemination and utilization. The first research and development program focuses on the *family* as an agent in the education process; the second concentrates on the *school* and factors that foster student resilience and learning success; the third addresses the *community* and its relevance to improving educational outcomes in inner cities. The focus of the *dissemination and utilization* program is not only to ensure that CEIC's findings are known, but also to create a crucible in which the Center's work is shaped by feedback from the field to maximize its usefulness in promoting the educational success of inner-city children, youth, and families.

CEIC Senior Associates

Margaret C. Wang
Director, CEIC and CRHDE
Professor of Educational Psychology
Temple University

Aquiles Iglesias, Associate Director, CEIC
Associate Professor and Chair,
Speech-Language-Hearing
Temple University

Lascelles Anderson
Professor and Director,
Center for Urban
Educational Research and
Development
University of Illinois
at Chicago

David Bartelt
Associate Professor of
Geography and Urban
Studies and Director,
Institute for Public
Policy Studies
Temple University

William Boyd
Professor of Education
Pennsylvania State
University

Gayle Dakof
Visiting Assistant
Professor of
Counseling Psychology
Temple University

H. Jerome Freiberg
Professor of Curriculum
and Instruction
University of Houston

Michael Goetz
Associate Professor
of Economics
Temple University

Geneva Haertel
Senior Research Associate
CRHDE
Temple University

Howard Liddle
Professor of Counseling
Psychology
Temple University

Maynard C. Reynolds
Professor Emeritus of
Educational Psychology
University of Minnesota

Leo Rigsby
Associate Professor of
Sociology
Temple University

Judith Stull
Associate Professor of
Sociology
La Salle University

William Stull
Professor and Chair,
Department of Economics
Temple University

Ronald Taylor
Associate Professor of
Psychology
Temple University

Herbert J. Walberg
Research Professor
of Education
University of Illinois
at Chicago

Hersholt C. Waxman
Associate Dean for
Research and Associate
Professor of Curriculum
and Instruction
University of Houston

Kenneth Wong
Associate Professor
Department of Education
and Social Sciences
University of Chicago

William Yancey
Professor of Sociology
Temple University

Andrea Zetlin
Associate Professor
Special Education
California State
University, Los Angeles

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT THE CENTER LIBRARY (215/204-1442)